DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 205 TM 004 661

AUTHOR Whaples, Gene C.
TITLE Attitudes Toward Blacks of White Adults Involved in 4-H Youth Programs.
INSTITUTION National Four-H Club Foundation, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Extension Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.; Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.; Maryland Univ., College Park. Cooperative Extension Service.
PUB DATE Jun 74
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Adults; *Attitude Tests; Caucasians; Factor Analysis; Negroes; *Race Relations; *Racial Attitudes; Semantic Differential; Sex Differences; *Situational Tests; Test Reliability; Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Situational Attitude Scale

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if the attitudes of white adults attending training at the National 4-H Foundation were more negative toward blacks than they were toward whites and to determine if the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was a valid and reliable tool for measuring the attitudes of white adults toward blacks. The SAS is a combination of situations with racial overtones and semantic differential scales. The scale presents ten personal and social situations in which race might be a variable in reaction to the situation. For each situation ten bipolar semantic differential scales were written. Two forms of the SAS were developed. The instrument was tested for reliability using factor analysis on the 351 adults reported on in this study. Subjects were approximately 40 percent male and 60 percent female. The study revealed that in some situations as identified in the SAS there is a significant difference in the attitudes of the white adults involved in this research. These attitudes were generally more negative toward blacks than they were toward whites. Significant factors related to these attitudes included the region of the country and the population density of the area of residence. Sex also may be a factor. Factors found not significant included age and the position in the organization held by the subject. (Author/RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED109205

ATTITUDES TOWARD BLACKS OF WHITE ADULTS INVOLVED IN 4-H YOUTH PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A 4-H INTERN REPORT

By

Gene C. Whaples
Program Leader, 4-H and Youth
University of Maryland

June, 1974

TM 004 661

Extension Service - U. S. Department of Agriculture - Washington, D. C. 20250

This study is based on data collected while the author was an Intern at the National 4-H Foundation. Computer time for interpretation of the data was provided by the University of Maryland Computer Science Center. Complete analyses of variance tables for support of the findings are available at the State 4-H Office, University of Maryland, College Park.

An earlier report, "The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) As An Attitude Measurement Tool For Adults Involved in Extension 4-H Youth Programs," provided additional interpretation of the data.

This project was made possible through the cooperation of the Cooperative Extension Service of the State of Maryland, The Extension Service, USDA, and the National 4-H Foundation, Inc., supported by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Intern Sub-committee of the National 4-H Youth S'aff Development and Training Committee:

Dr. Einar Ryden, Chairman
Dr. Milton Boyce
Mr. Joseph McAuliffe

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
I. Significance of The Problem	5
II. Objectives	6
III. Hypothesis	6
IV. Definitions	6
V. Situational Attitude Scale	7
VI. Population	11
VII. Administration	12
VIII. Analysis	13
IX. Limitations of Study	14
X. Results	14
XI. Conclusions and Recommendations	32
LITERATURE CITED	35

LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
1.	Least Squares Means, Standard Error and F Test for White Adults Completing the Situational Attitude Scale	15
2.	Least Squares Means, Standard Error and F Test for White Adults Completing the Situational Attitude Scale, Sex (Male-Female) Interacting with Group (Control-Treatment)	24
3.	Least Squares Means, Standard Error and F Test for White Adults Completing the Situational Attitude Scale, Region of Country (East, Central, South, West) Interacting with Group (Control-Treatment). .	26
4.	Least Squares Means, Standard Error and F Test for White Adults Completing the Situational Attitude Scale, Area of Residence (Farm, Town under 10,000 and Open Country, Towns and Cities 10,000+, Suburbs of Cities 50,000+, Central City 50,000+) Interacting with Group (Control-Treatment)	29

INTRODUCTION

"As the decade of the 1970s unfolds, racially related feelings, attitudes, and behaviours have become of paramount importance to all Americans."[1] Campbell stated,

> The racial situation in the United States defies understanding. The complexity and variety of the relationships between members of the two major races is so great that both white people and black tend to rely on simple generalities which reduce the problem to manageable terms.[2]

According to Harrington,[3] the ultimate racial barrier is discrimination by color.

Meil felt that social isolation from blacks in part accounts for white Americans' unawareness of the pervasiveness of racism in the fabric of our society.[4] The United States National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders wrote:

> The nation has not reversed the movement apart. Blacks and whites remain deeply divided in their perceptions and experiences of American society. The deepening of concern about conditions in the slums and ghettos on the part of some white persons and institutions has been counterbalanced--perhaps overbalanced--by a deepening of aversion and resistance on the part of others.[5]

Harrington indicated that "to be equal, the Negro requires something much more profound than a way 'into' the society. He needs a transformation of some of the basic institutions of the society."[6] White America "is convinced by more than a majority that the major

institutions in the country (with the exception of real estate companies) are helping rather than retarding Negroes."[7]

Helen Ball indicated her feelings toward the job ahead by writing:

> It seems the time has come for the main thrust of white energies to be directed toward elimination of those barriers--attitudinal, behavioral, and institutional--which mock the American ideas of equal opportunity and freedom of choice, while, at the same time, Negroes devote their efforts to increasing their capabilities and power.[8]

This concern was supported by the United States Commission on Civil Rights. They indicated that a primary task of the white community in the United States is to help provide attitudes and actions concerning racism.[9] In 1969 Schwebel suggested that many elements of the social fabric of our nation must be changed and that "in the process of modifying the system, the adults--parents and teachers among them--change their own thinking and their own behavior."[10]

This concern received earlier support through the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which has been interpreted as follows: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."[11] For some state Cooperative Extension Services the challenge was the merger of separate black and white systems.[12]

In discussing discrimination practices that are prohibited, the rules and regulations supplied by the office of the Secretary of Agriculture states that the Cooperative Agricultural Extension program shall not show "discrimination in making available or in the manner of

making available instruction, demonstrations, information, and publications offered by or through the Cooperative Extension Service."[13]

A July 1964 notification to state Extension Services re-emphasized the concern for balanced programming:

> This notification should make it clear that the Cooperative Extension Service cannot provide assistance to any organization that excludes any person from membership or participation in any activities of the organization, or subjects any person to discrimination because of race, color, or national origin.[14]

The 1967 National Policy Statement on Staff Training and Development for Extension stated:

> The effectiveness of educational programs of Extension will depend on the abilities and skills of its professional staff. Well qualified personnel with the capacity to grow and mature on the job and with the ability to adjust to changing demands are imperative if Extension is to continue to be a vital force in meeting the needs of the people.[15]

A study committee on Cooperative Extension reported in A People and A Spirit, as they looked toward the challenges of the Seventies:

> One of the bitter realities of the American society is the alienation of large numbers of people because of their ethnic origin. Many of these, such as Indians, Negroes, Mexican-American, Puerto Ricans, have never been in the mainstream of our national life. . . . Segregated socially, psychologically, and physically, people in these groups may suffer damage which helps solidify their subordinate status. . . . Helping them is a long, hard educational process that will take much understanding and a great deal of persistent individual effort.[16]

In presenting its recommendation, the committee called upon Extension to adapt its staff and programs to serve the pressing social and behavioral sciences in staffing and the need to "upgrade professional

competency of personnel by increasing both formal and informal staff training and development."[17]

A major challenge facing Extension 4-H Youth Programs today is balanced programming, or providing Extension's services equally to the citizens with the delivery of the services not based on income, race, creed, sex, or location of residence. It is felt that for Extension to accomplish this task will require a change in the behavior and attitudes toward the black minority of many of those employed by Extension as well as many of those served by Extension. Shaw and Wright stated that "the assessment of attitudes of one race toward another appears crucial in a better understanding of race relations."[18]

Hilgard and Bower quoted Thorndike as saying, "The attitude or set determines not only what a person will do but will satisfy or annoy him."[19] Kiesler, Collins and Miller stated, "That attitudes are forged out of previous experience is perhaps the least controversial issue in America. . . ."[20] Kingsley underlined the importance of attitude development when he wrote: "Among the various tendencies and predispositions which are acquired and modified by learning, none is more important to individual and social welfare than attitude and ideals."[21]

I. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

For the Extension 4-H and Youth program to meet the requirements of the 1964 Civil Rights Act there must first be developed a "bench-mark" to determine what the attitudes of its predominantly white professional staff are toward the black minority. This information will be useful in determining future program direction, training requirements and staffing needs.

Dr. Roy D. Cassell supported the need for attitudinal research when he stated:

> Each state is supposed to conduct a continuing training program in civil rights. Attitudinal research could help to identify some very specific training needs. A state could design a type of training program for its current staff based upon the results of this study as well as an orientation program for new staff members. One of the concerns that we have here is the apparent lack of orientation of state specialists to their responsibilities in civil rights. This may not deal with that specifically but it would tie in to a greater portion to the staff located in the field.[22]

Documentation has been presented which outlines the racial challenges facing the United States and the Cooperative Extension Service. Their concern for balanced programming has been outlined and emphasized. However, in the ten years since the Civil Rights Act no research has been carried out that deals with racial attitudes of Cooperative Extension Service personnel. The Situational Attitude Scale, developed by Sedlacek and Brooks,[23] shows promise for research in the racial attitude area.

II. OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this study was to determine if the attitudes of white adults attending training at the National 4-H Foundation were more negative toward blacks than they were toward whites and to determine if the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was a valid and reliable tool for measuring the attitudes of white adults toward blacks.

III. HYPOTHESIS

The null hypothesis tested was: there is no difference in racial attitudes of white adults attending workshops at the National 4-H Foundation.

IV. DEFINITIONS

Balanced Programming. Providing Extension's services equally to the citizens with the delivery of the services not based on income, race, creed, sex or location of residence.

Attitude. "A relatively enduring system of evaluation, affective reaction based upon and reflecting the evaluative concepts of beliefs which have been learned about the characteristics of a social object or class of social objects."[24]

SAS. Situational Attitude Scale.

Eastern Region. Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, District of Columbia.

Central Region. Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

Southern Region. Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.

Western Region. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Guam.

Cooperative Extension Service, also Extension. An organization created by the passage of the 1914 Smith-Lever Act to ". . . take practical information from the land-grant colleges and the Department of Agriculture to 'the people of the United States' in their local environment."[25]

V. SITUATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE (SAS)

According to Oppenheim, attitude scales are the more sophisticated of the many ways of assessing people's attitudes. He felt, however, that "attitude scales are relatively crude measuring instruments. . . . Their chief function is to divide people roughly into . . . groups."[26]

However, Osgood et al. stated:

> One of the most common criticisms of attitude scales of all types is that they do not allow us to predict actual behavior in real-life situations. Like most such arguments, this one is overdrawn. Most proponents of attitude measurements have agreed that attitude scores indicate only a disposition toward certain classes of behavior, broadly defined, and that what overt response actually occurs in a real-life situation depends also upon the context provided by the situation.[27]

Semantic differential scaling techniques were first developed by Osgood. He described it as a "combination of associational and scaling procedures."[28] The semantic differential attitude scale uses a continuum of five or seven steps with definable polar terms at either end.

The SAS, as developed by Sedlacek and Brooks,[29] is a unique combination of situations with racial overtones and semantic differential scales. The scale presents ten personal and social situations in which race might be a variable in reaction to the situation. For each situation ten bipolar semantic differential scales were written. Two forms of the SAS were developed. The forms were identical except for the insertion of the word "black" in each situation in form B. When used on four hundred and five white graduate students at the University of Maryland, the reliability of the SAS was estimated by the computation of communalities in principle components factor analysis. The median commurality for A and B was .64 and .65. Fifty-five of the hundred items showed significant difference between forms A and B when the t test was administered, indicating that the insertion of the word "black" lead subjects to respond differently and provided evidence that there is validity of fifty-five items.

Charles Eberly[30] attempted to validate and determine the reliability of the Sedlacek and Brooks studies using the SAS. In 1970 he administered the questionnaire to a random sample of 1,643 freshman and transfer students at Michigan State University. The results were consistent with those found by Sedlacek and Brooks. There was slight difference in the reported median communalities, with Eberly reporting a .55 for form A and .68 for form B. A multiple t test at the .05 level

of significance showed that fifty-eight of the one hundred items were significantly different. The study in general reflected that college students have a significantly more negative attitude toward blacks than toward whites.

The SAS has also been administered to adults. In 1970 Ball[31] tested 103 white educators in College of Education courses at the University of Maryland. A two tailed t test of mean response difference between forms A and B revealed that thirty-three of the one hundred items were significantly different at the .05 level. This study indicated that the social response of white educators tends to be more negative than those of white college students but showed fewer differences in reaction when race was mentioned and indicated a positive reaction toward blacks in more situations.

Further application of the SAS to adults was accomplished by Sedlacek et al. and reported in 1973.[32] This study involved 229 white college freshmen and sixty-eight of their parents. The results indicated that both parents and students had generally negative attitudes toward blacks. Parents reacted more negatively in four of the situations (rape, magazine salesman, policeman and standing on a bus) than did their children, while the students reacted more negatively to the situation involving youth stealing. Fifty-nine of the one hundred items were significant on group. Ten items were significant on the interaction of form and group. However, this comparison could have been due to chance at the .05 level.

The instrument was tested for reliability using factor analysis on the 351 adults being reported on in this study. The median communality

for form A was .76 and for form B was .74.[33]

A study has also been completed on a random sample of 130 white 4-H professionals in the Northeast Region of the United States.[34]

Analysis at the .05 level of significance revealed that attitudes were different in three of ten situations. Situation V, friend becomes engaged, created a negative reaction based on the individual items that were significant in this situation. It can be said that the subjects felt less aggressive, less happy, less tolerant, less complimented, less overjoyed, less excited, less right and were less pleased if their friend became engaged to a black.

There was a significant difference in attitude in Situation III, man selling magazines, and Situation VI, stopped by a policeman. The subjects felt less angered, less annoyed, more tolerant and more friendly if the magazine salesman was black. They also felt more trusting and more safe if the policeman was black.

These two situations could possibly appear to be stereotyping of blacks in service roles and, in fact, are also non-acceptable attitudes toward blacks.

Sex, age and area of residence during childhood ages one to ten were not factors related to attitudes in any of the ten situations. Whether the subject was a member of an integrated staff at the professional level was a factor in Situation II. In this situation, persons who were members of an integrated staff reacted more negatively if the man was black, while persons who were not members of an integrated staff reacted less negatively. It should be noted that out of ten situations, one significant situation in ten would not be unusual by chance at the .05 level.

VI. POPULATION

The study was conducted at the National 4-H Center, a facility operated by the National 4-H Club Foundation of America, a private non-profit educational institution. The primary function of the Foundation is "to augment the youth work of Extension through training, research, and development programs funded primarily from private sources."[35] One of the key objectives of the Foundation is to "strengthen and expand practical training for professionals, para-professionals, adult volunteer and teen leaders at international, national, regional and local levels in accordance with Cooperative Extension Service policy."[36]

The population for this study consisted of Extension professionals and volunteer leaders attending workshops conducted by the Education division of the National 4-H Foundation during September, October, and November of 1973. Members of the Foundation staff were also included in the study.

Of the total number (N=395) of subjects, six were black. Their response sheets were removed. An additional thirty-eight were excluded from analysis due to incomplete data. The final N was 351. Demographic information was obtained on the dimensions of sex, age, region, area of residence, and position.

The subjects were approximately forty percent male and sixty percent female. Their ages ranged from twenty to over sixty, with the majority falling into age group thirty to fifty. Over fifty percent of those completing the questionnaire were from the central region. Thirty percent were from the east, with the remainder fairly evenly split between the south and west. The majority of the subjects were from rural areas;

however, more than thirty-eight percent represented more urban areas. Forty-eight percent were volunteer 4-H leaders, and twenty-seven percent were 4-H professionals. This group included forty-one State 4-H Leaders.

VII. ADMINISTRATION

The SAS booklets consisted of either Form A or B, a response sheet, and an information sheet used to collect demographic data. Material was stacked alternately and administered to both individuals and groups. After distribution of the questionnaire, response sheets and pencil, subjects were instructed to respond to the word scales according to the printed instructions and to raise their hand if they had a question rather than to verbalize and distract others. Total administration time was fifteen to thirty minutes per individual or group. Subjects were not informed that there were two forms being used.

After the SAS materials were collected, the response sheets were prepared so that punched cards could be machine produced by the Digitek Optical Scanner. The preparation consisted of transferring data and checking for stray and/or light pencil marks, double entries, erased precoded form designation, assigning median value (i.e., 2, scale 0-4) where ten or fewer missing responses occurred, deleting response sheets where more than ten missing responses occurred, deleting patterned response sheets (the positive pole for each item was varied randomly from right to left to avoid response set), and transferring demographic information to response sheets.

VIII. ANALYSIS

Harvey's Least Squares and Maximum Likelihood General Purpose Program for factorial analysis of variance was used in analyzing the data.[37] A factorial analysis design with group, sex, age, region, position, and residence as main effects and their interaction with group was developed. All interpretations were made at the .05 level of significance. A comparison of means was made for all significant F tests. The Newman-Keul's test for multiple comparison of means was selected to be used for comparison of more than two means.[38]

The null hypothesis was: there is no difference in racial attitudes of white adults attending workshops at the National 4-H Foundation.

Data for this hypothesis were analyzed using an F test for comparison between groups (control - Form A, or treatment - Form B) for each of the one hundred items. An F test was also conducted for each of the situations (I through X). Sums of the item scores for each of the ten items in each situation were used as the situation score.

The following interactions were interpreted based on situation scores, and data can be found in supporting tables. Data relating to sex were studied by interpreting the interaction of group (control - Form A, or treatment - Form B) and Sex (male - female). Data related to age was studied by interpreting the interaction of group (control - Form A, or treatment - Form B) and age (29 years and younger, 30-39 years, 40-49 years, 50-59 years, and 60 years and older). Region of the country the subject resided in was studied by interpreting the interaction of group (control - Form A, or treatment - Form B) and

region (Eastern, Central, Southern, and Western). Data related to job or position was studied by interpreting the interaction of group (control - Form A, or treatment - Form B) and position. Data related to area of residence was studied by interpreting the interaction of group (control - Form A, or treatment - Form B) and residence (farm, towns of 10,000 and open country, towns and cities 10,000 to 50,000, suburbs of cities 50,000, and central cities).

IX. LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

The results of the study were limited in interpretation to white adults attending workshops at the National 4-H Center during the time of the study.

X. RESULTS

The null hypothesis was: there is no difference in racial attitudes of white adults attending workshops at the National 4-H Foundation. Data supporting the discussion of this hypothesis can be found in Table 1. A factorial analysis of the one hundred items (ten for each situation) was completed. The table presents a comparison of scores between groups (control - treatment). Age, sex, area of residence, region of residence, and position are also included as main effects in the factorial analysis. The interaction of the above with group was also calculated. This procedure helped to strengthen the statistical test by reducing the residual variance.

Based on group (control - Form A, treatment - Form B), thirteen of

TABLE 1. Least Squares Means, Standard Error And F Test For White Adults Completing The Situational Attitude Scale

(Control - Form A, Treatment - Form B)

Item Number	Situations / Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A (N=176) L.S. Mean	Control - Form A (N=176) S.E.	Treatment - Form B (B=175) L.S. Mean	Treatment - Form B (B=175) S.E.	F	
	I. NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR	29.56	1.23	25.17	.99	7.72	***
1	good - bad	.99	.18	1.87	.15	13.94	****
2	safe - unsafe	.99	.19	1.45	.15	3.55	*
3	angry - not angry	3.32	.23	3.11	.18	3.72	*
4	friendly - unfriendly	.55	.18	1.02	.14	4.16	**
5	sympathetic - not sympathetic	1.32	.23	1.46	.18	.22	
6	nervous - calm	2.81	.26	2.50	.20	.89	
7	happy - sad	1.35	.19	1.98	.15	7.10	***
8	objectionable - acceptable	2.98	.23	2.72	.18	.83	
9	desirable - undesirable	1.38	.21	1.91	.16	4.06	**
10	suspicious - trusting	3.02	.21	2.52	.17	3.40	*
	II. MAN RAPED WOMAN	13.48	.87	14.26	.69	.49	
11	affection - disgust	3.41	.17	3.51	.13	.22	
12	relish - repulsion	3.60	.16	3.42	.13	.87	
13	happy - sad	3.63	.13	3.73	.10	.38	
14	friendly - hostile	3.13	.19	3.06	.15	.09	
15	uninvolved - involved	2.05	.26	2.25	.21	.39	
16	hope - hopelessness	1.95	.24	2.30	.19	1.27	
17	aloof - outraged	3.07	.19	2.68	.15	2.48	
18	injure - kill	1.50	.19	1.38	.15	3.35	
19	safe - fearful	2.53	.21	2.58	.17	.03	
20	empathetic - can't understand	2.57	.22	2.62	.18	.03	

**** = signigicant at .001 (1,300 df)
*** = significant at .01 (1,300 df)
** = significant at .05 (1,300 df)
* = significant at .10 (1,300 df)

TABLE 1. (continued)

Item Number	Situations / Bipoplar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A (N=176) L.S. Mean	S.E.	Treatment - Form B (N= 175) L.S. Mean	S.E.	F	
	III. MAN SELLING MAGAZINES	16.40	1.25	19.21	1.00	3.10	*
21	relaxed - startled	2.00	.24	2.07	.19	.06	
22	receptive - cautious	3.11	.23	2.76	.18	1.42	
23	excited - unexcited	3.16	.23	2.25	.18	9.43	***
24	glad - angered	2.56	.16	2.19	.13	3.33	*
25	pleased - annoyed	2.82	.18	2.54	.14	1.42	
26	indifferent - suspicious	2.35	.25	1.74	.20	3.60	*
27	tolerable - intolerable	2.18	.23	1.59	.18	4.11	**
28	afraid - secure	2 22	.23	2.33	.18	2.45	
29	friend - enemy	2.04	.17	2.01	.14	.02	
30	unprotected - protected	2.39	.22	2.04	.17	1.56	
	IV. CORNER OF LOITERING MEN	19.47	.78	18.52	.62	.92	
31	relaxed - tensed	2.68	.21	3.05	.16	1.99	
32	pleased - angered	2.13	.15	2.23	.12	.29	
33	superior - inferior	1.87	.16	2.06	.13	.88	
34	smarter - dumber	1.84	.14	1.97	.12	.53	
35	whiter - blacker	1.91	.18	1.47	.14	3.52	*
36	aggressive - passive	2.30	.17	2.22	.14	.13	
37	safe - unsafe	2.10	.22	2.68	.17	4.32	**
38	friendly - unfriendly	2.11	.21	2.06	.17	.03	
39	excited - unexcited	2.13	.22	1.76	.17	1.71	
40	trivial - important	1.66	.22	2.07	.17	2.20	

TABLE 1. (continued)

Item Number	Situations / Bipoplar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A (N=176) L.S. Mean	S.E.	Treatment - Form B (N=175) L.S. Mean	S.E.	F.	
	V. FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED	29.94	1.30	19.61	1.04	38.49	****
41	aggressive - passive	2.11	.22	1.94	.18	.34	
42	happy - sad	.44	.18	2.36	.14	68.16	****
43	tolerable - intolerable	1.00	.22	1.80	.18	8.12	***
44	complimented - insulted	1.34	.19	2.02	.15	7.96	***
45	angered - overjoyed	3.27	.18	2.05	.15	26.52	****
46	secure - fearful	1.27	.20	2.00	.16	7.96	***
47	hopeful - hopeless	.89	.16	1.87	.18	14.08	****
48	excited - unexcited	.92	.20	2.03	.16	18.32	****
49	right - wrong	.78	.21	2.47	.17	36.61	****
50	disgusting - pleasing	3.41	.20	1.99	.16	32.18	****
	VI. STOPPED BY POLICEMAN	24.60	1.24	26.59	.99	1.56	
51	calm - nervous	2.93	.28	2.18	.22	4.44	**
52	trusting - suspicious	1.26	.23	1.05	.18	.51	
53	afraid - safe	1.92	.26	2.73	.21	5.61	**
54	friendly - unfriendly	1.23	.21	1.04	.17	.48	
55	tolerant - intolerant	1.09	.20	.94	.16	3.21	*
56	bitter - pleasant	2.55	.23	2.54	.18	.00	
57	cooperative - uncooperative	.55	.18	.50	.14	.06	
58	acceptive - belligerent	.67	.18	.69	.15	.00	
59	inferior - superior	1.88	.15	1.78	.12	.30	
60	smarter - dumber	1.99	.15	1.94	.12	.07	

TABLE 1 (continued)

Item Number	Situations / Bipoplar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A (N=176 L.S. Mean	S.E.	Treatment - Form B (N=175) L.S. Mean	S.E.	F	
	VII. PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP	29.82	1.24	27.31	.99	2.50	
61	warm - cold	.87	.18	.90	.14	5.02	**
62	sad - happy	3.17	.18	2.64	.15	5.14	**
63	superior - inferior	1.82	.12	1.87	.10	.13	
64	threatened - neutral	3.36	.21	3.02	.17	1.63	
65	pleased - displeased	.98	.19	1.34	.15	2.27	
66	understanding - indifferent	1.09	.19	1.18	.15	.15	
67	suspicious - trusting	3.10	.20	2.88	.15	.79	
68	disappointed - elated	2.83	.17	2.41	.13	3.78	*
69	favorable - unfavorable	.90	.19	1.25	.15	1.96	
70	uncomfortable - comfortable	3.03	.21	2.91	.16	.20	
	VIII. YOUNGSTER STEALS	24.32	.97	22.06	.77	3.33	*
71	surprising - not surprising	1.60	.25	1.93	.20	1.36	
72	sad - happy	.52	.15	.56	.12	.04	
73	disinterested - interested	3.16	.19	3.12	.15	.03	
74	close - distant	1.63	.21	1.92	.17	1.15	
75	understandable - baffling	2.25	.24	1.87	.19	1.54	
76	responsible - not responsible	1.90	.24	1.90	.19	.03	
77	concerned - unconcerned	.37	.18	.96	.14	6.88	***
78	sympathy - indifference	.98	.21	1.35	.17	1.84	
79	expected - unexpected	2.35	.21	2.21	.17	.25	
80	hopeful - hopeless	1.42	.24	1.65	.19	.59	
	IX. CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION	18.67	1.33	16.89	1.06	1.09	
81	bad - good	1.84	.22	1.33	.17	3.39	*
82	understanding - indifferent	1.93	.22	1.81	.18	.18	
83	suspicious - trusting	1.95	.20	1.81	.16	.34	
84	safe - unsafe	2.02	.31	2.23	.19	.48	

TABLE 1. (continued)

Item Number	Situations / Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A (N=176) L.S. Mean	S.E.	Treatment - Form B (N=175) L.S. Mean	S.E.	F	
85	disturbed - undisturbed	1.54	.22	1.44	.18	.12	
86	justified - unjustified	1.90	.20	2.13	.16	.79	
87	tense - calm	1.96	.23	1.64	.18	1.20	
88	hate - love	2.07	.15	1.95	.12	.39	
89	wrong - right	1.78	.20	1.72	.16	.05	
90	humorous - serious	2.62	.10	2.82	.15	.73	
	X. ONLY PERSON STANDING	26.57	1.39	23.55	1.11	2.87	*
91	fearful - secure	2.70	.24	2.06	.19	4.47	**
92	tolerable - intolerable	1.02	.21	1.16	.17	.27	
93	hostile - indifferent	2.91	.19	2.66	.15	1.03	
94	important - trivial	2.79	.22	2.82	.17	.02	
95	conspicuous - inconspicuous	1.72	.25	1.20	.20	2.51	
96	calm - anxious	1.21	.24	1.99	.19	6.50	**
97	indignant - understanding	3.16	.20	2.94	.16	.66	
98	comfortable - uncomfortable	2.07	.27	2.08	.21	.00	
99	hate - love	2.52	.14	2.17	.11	3.71	
100	not resentful - resentful	.91	.22	1.08	.17	.34	

the one hundred items were found to be significant at or above the .01 level (1, 7, 23, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 77). An additional nine items were found to be significant at or above the .05 level (4, 9, 27, 37, 51, 53, 62, 91, 96). These can be found in Table 1. There was interaction with group on forty items (group x sex: 7, 9, 27, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53; group x region: 1, 9, 10, 42, 45, 47, 49, 50, 71, 72, 96; group x area of residence: 12, 13, 14, 20, 42, 43, 44, 46, 50, 61, 70, 71; and group x age: 17, 90, 93).

For these fifty-three items and the two situations which were found significant at or above the .05 level, there is a difference in attitudes. The ten situations on the Situational Attitude Scale were:

Form A

I. A new family moves in next door to you.

II. You read in the paper that a man has raped a woman.

III. It is evening and a man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.

IV. You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young men are loitering.

V. Your best friend has just become engaged.

VI. You are stopped for speeding by a policeman.

VII. A new person joins your social group.

VIII. You see a youngster steal something in a dime store.

IX. Some students on campus stage a demonstration.

X. You get on a bus and you are the only person who has to stand.

Form B

I. A black family moves in next door to you.

II. You read in the paper that a black man has raped a white woman.

III. It is evening and a black man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.

IV. You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young black men are loitering.

V. Your best friend has just become engaged to a black person.

VI. You are stopped for speeding by a black policeman.

VII. A new black person joins your social group.

VIII. You see a black youngster steal something in a dime store.

IX. Some black students on campus stage a demonstration.

X. You get on a bus that has all balck people aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.

The most significant situation and the one that seems to create the greatest negative reaction is Situation V, Friend Becomes Engaged. Based on the individual items that were significant in this situation, it can be said that white adults who attended workshops at the National 4-H Foundation during the time of the study were more sad, less tolerant. less complimented, less overjoyed, less excited, had a feeling of more wrong, and were more disgusted if their friend became engaged to a black. The next situation in which there is a significant difference at the .01

level is Situation I, New Family Next Door. Subjects felt less good, less friendly, less happy, and felt the situation was undesirable if the family was black.

Although Situation X did not reach the .05 level of significance, it is significant at .10 or above and deserves attention. Two items in this situation, You get on a bus (that has all black people aboard) and you are the only person who has to stand, were significant at or above the .05 level. In this situation, if white subjects were standing in a bus filled with blacks, they felt less secure, less calm. This situation is representative of the kinds of situations in which white professionals may find themselves while servicing predominantly black areas. Situation VIII, Youngster Steals, was also singificant at the .10 level. In this situation, the subjects were less concerned if the youngsters were black.

One other situation was significant at the .10 level. That was Situation III, Man Selling Magazines. In this situation, subjects felt more excited and less tolerant if the salesman was black.

Five additional situations were non-significant. These were: II. You read in the paper that a (black) man has raped a (white) woman, IV. You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young (black) men are loitering, VI. You are stopped for speeding by a (black) policeman, VII. A new (black) person joins your social group, and IX. Some (black) students on campus stage a demonstration.

Based on these results, it is concluded that at the .05 level of significance attitudes of white 4-H and Youth professionals in the North-

east Region of the United States are different toward blacks in twenty-two of the one hundred items and in two of the ten situations.

Females have more negative attitudes toward their friend becoming engaged to a black than do males, Situation V (significant at .001). Table 2 also shows that none of the other situations reached significance at the .05 level or above.

In looking at regional differences, the study reveals (see table 3) that in six of the situations (I, IV, V, VI, IX, X) the order from most positive to least positive is East, West, Central, South. In all but two situations (II, III) the Eastern Region held the more positive attitudes toward blacks. In all but two situations (II,VI) the Southern Region held the least positive attitude toward blacks. Two situations showed significant differences at or above the .05 level. These were Situation I, New Family Next Door, and Situation V, Friend Becomes Engaged. In Situation I, subjects from the East felt more positive about having a new black family move in next door than did the subjects from either the South or the Central regions of the United States. In Situation V, Friend Becomes Engaged, subjects from the South felt much more negative than did subjects from the East, if the friend became engaged to a black.

In Table 4, six situations (I, IV, V, VI, VII, X) showed that subjects who lived on a farm hold the most negative attitudes toward blacks. In addition, three situations (II, III, IX) show they hold the second most negative attitudes. Those subjects who lived in the the central city hold the most positive attitudes toward blacks in eight of the situations (I, III, IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, X). Subjects from towns under

TABLE 2 Least Squares Means, Standard Error and F Test For White Adults Completing The Situational Attitude Scale Sex (Male - Female) Interacting With Group (Control - Treatment)

Item Number	Situations / Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A L.S. Mean (N for Male = 68, Female=108)	Control - Form A S.E.	Treatment - Form B L.S. Mean (N for Male=71, Female= 104)	Treatment - Form B S.E.	F	
I.	NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR					2.73	
	Male	29.34	1.39	26.32	1.13		
	Female	29.78	1.35	24.02	1.16		
II.	MAN RAPED WOMAN					.31	
	Male	14.11	.98	14.56	.80		
	Female	12.85	.95	13.95	.81		
III.	MAN SELLING MAGAZINES					.00	
	Male	17.18	1.41	20.06	1.15		
	Female	15.60	1.37	18.36	1.17		
IV.	CORNER OF LOITERING MEN					.09	
	Male	20.40	.87	19.60	.71		
	Female	18.54	.85	17.44	.72		
V.	FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED					17.06	****
	Male	29.42	1.47	21.71	1.19		
	Female	31.45	1.42	17.51	1.22		

**** = significant at .001 (1,300 df)

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Item Number	Situation / Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A L.S. Mean (N for Male=68, Female-108)	Control - Form A S.E.	Treatment - Form B L.S. Mean (N for Male=71, Female=104)	Treatment - Form B S.E.	F
VI.	STOPPED BY POLICEMAN					
	Male	24.86	1.40	26.43	1.14	.23
	Female	24.36	1.36	26.75	1.16	
VII.	PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP					
	Male	30.32	1.40	27.74	1.14	.01
	Female	29.33	1.36	26.88	1.16	
VIII.	YOUNGSTER STEALS					
	Male	24.02	1.09	22.89	.89	3.02
	Female	24.62	1.06	21.22	.91	
IX.	CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION					
	Male	18.91	1.50	17.59	1.22	.26
	Female	18.43	1.45	16.20	1.24	
X.	ONLY PERSON STANDING					
	Male	27.60	1.57	25.56	1.28	.00
	Female	25.55	1.53	22.54	1.30	

TABLE 3

Least Squares Means, Standard Error and F Test For White Adults Completing The Situational Attitude Scale Region of Country (East, Central, South, West) Interacting With Group (Control - Treatment)

Item Number	Situations / Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A L.S. Mean	Control - Form A S.E.	Treatment - Form B L.S. Mean	Treatment - Form B S.E.	F	
I.	NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR						
	East[a]	29.01	1.41	22.13	1.23		
	Central	30.23	1.30	20.21	1.56		
	South	32.53	2.43	15.09	2.17	3.27	**
	West	28.00	2.47	21.01	2.23		
II.	MAN RAPED WOMAN						
	East	24.23	1.35	26.95	1.18		
	Central	25.37	1.24	25.96	1.10		
	South	24.39	2.32	26.11	2.08	.04	
	West	24.42	2.36	27.34	2.14		

*** Significant at .01 (3,300df)
** Significant at .05 (3,300df)

[a]

	Control	Treatment
N For East =	53	53
N For Central =	104	97
N For South =	10	14
N For West =	9	11

TABLE 3 (continued)

Item Number	Situations / Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A L.S. Mean	Control - Form A S.E.	Treatment - Form B L.S. Mean	Treatment - Form B S.E.	F	
III.	MAN SELLING MAGAZINES						
	East	16.721	1.36	19.53	1.19		
	Central	17.46	1.25	19.10	1.11	.87	
	South	17.45	2.34	17.97	2.09		
	West	13.94	2.38	20.24	2.15		
IV.	CORNER OF LOITERING MEN						
	East	19.79	.84	19.55	.74		
	Central	20.06	.78	18.65	.69	.62	
	South	19.35	1.45	17.17	1.30		
	West	18.68	1.47	18.70	1.33		
V.	FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED						
	East	29.02	1.41	22.13	1.24		
	Central	30.23	1.30	20.21	1.16	3.78	***
	South	32.53	2.43	15.09	2.18		
	West	28.00	2.47	21.01	2.24		
VI.	STOPPED BY POLICEMAN						
	East	24.23	1.35	26.95	1.18		
	Central	25.37	1.24	25.96	1.10	.52	
	South	24.39	2.32	26.11	2.08		
	West	24.42	2.36	27.34	2.14		
VII.	PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP						
	East	30.05	1.35	30.07	1.18		
	Central	30.70	1.24	28.25	1.10		
	South	30.39	2.32	24.28	2.08		
	West	28.15	2.36	26.64	2.14	1.45	

TABLE 3 (continued)

Item Number	Situations / Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A L.S. Mean	Control - Form A S.E.	Treatment - Form B L.S. Mean	Treatment - Form B S.E.	F
VIII.	YOUNGSTER STEALS					
	East	23.23	1.05	23.13	.92	
	Central	23.75	.97	22.75	.86	
	South	24.59	1.81	20.12	1.62	1.23
	West	25.71	1.84	22.24	1.67	
IX.	CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION					
	East	20.00	1.44	18.42	1.26	
	Central	18.29	1.33	16.93	1.18	.28
	South	18.64	2.48	14.70	2.22	
	West	17.76	2.52	17.53	2.28	
X.	ONLY PERSON STANDING					
	East	25.22	1.51	24.72	1.33	
	Central	28.14	1.39	23.45	1.24	
	South	27.65	2.60	21.53	2.33	1.90
	West	25.28	2.65	24.50	2.40	

Table 4

Least Squares Means, Standard Error and F Test For White Adults Completing The Situational Attitude Scale Area of Residence (Farm, Town Under 10,000 and Open Country Towns & Cities 10,000+, Suburbs of Cities 50,000+, Central City 50,000+) Interacting With Group (Control - Treatment)

Item Number	Situations / Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A L.S. Mean	Control - Form A S.E.	Treatment - Form B L.S. Mean	Treatment - Form B S.E.	F	
I.	NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR						
	Farm[a]	28.98	1.45	22.25	1.38		
	Town Under 10,000 & Open Country	29.08	1.52	22.50	1.37		
	Town and Cities 10,000+	30.67	1.47	27.14	1.44	1.66	
	Suburbs of Cities 50,000+	30.06	1.79	24.19	1.60		
	Central City 50,000	29.61	2.59	29.76	1.97		
II.	MAN RAPED WOMAN						
	Farm	12.99	1.02	12.86	.97		
	Town Under 10,000 & Open Country	13.91	1.02	12.51	.96		
	Towns and Cities 10,000+	12.14	1.03	17.12	1.01	4.11	***
	Suburbs of Cities 50,000+	13.55	1.26	14.41	1.12		
	Central City 50,000+	14.79	1.82	14.38	1.39		

*** Significant at .01 (4,300 df)

a	Control	Treatment
N For Farm	70	56
N For Town 10,000 & Open Country	39	48
N For Towns 10,000-50,000	37	31
N For Suburb 50,000	22	27
N For Central City	8	13

TABLE 4 (continued)

Item Number	Situations / Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A L.S. Mean	Control - Form A S.E.	Treatment - Form B L.S. Mean	Treatment - Form B S.E.	F	
III.	MAN SELLING MAGAZINES						
	Farm	15.00	1.46	18.75	1.40		
	Town Under 10,000	14.57	1.54	17.88	1.39		
	Towns and Cities 10,000+	16.93	1.49	20.22	1.45		
	Suburbs of Cities 50,000+	16.92	1.81	18.95	1.62	.16	
	Central City 50,000+	18.55	2.63	20.27	1.99		
IV.	CORNER OF LOITERING MEN						
	Farm	19.15	.91	17.41	.87		
	Town Under 10,000	19.50	.95	18.38	.86		
	Towns and Cities 10,000+	18.59	.92	18.14	.90	.22	
	Suburbs of Cities 50,000+	19.27	1.12	20.22	1.00		
	Central City 50,000+	20.85	1.63	20.55	1.24		
V.	FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED						
	Farm	31.34	1.52	16.38	1.45		
	Town Under 10,000	29.47	1.60	17.00	1.44	3.72	***
	Towns & Cities 10,000+	31.32	1.55	20.20	1.51		
	Suburbs of Cities 50,000+	30.75	1.88	19.50	1.60		
	Central Cities 50,000+	26.84	2.73	24.99	2.08		
VI.	STOPPED BY POLICEMAN						
	Farm	24.39	1.45	24.79	1.39		
	Town Under 10,000	24.37	1.53	28.34	1.38		
	Towns & Cities 10,000+	22.82	1.48	26.57	1.44	1.31	
	Suburbs of Cities 50,000+	25.33	1.80	27.83	1.61		
	Central Cities 50,000+	26.11	2.61	25.52	1.93		
VII.	PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP						
	Farm	30.82	1.45	25.51	1.39		
	Town Under 10,000	28.66	1.53	25.91	1.38		
	Towns and Cities 10,000+	29.70	1.48	27.48	1.44		
	Suburbs of Cities 50,000+	20.83	1.80	26.96	1.61	1.12	
	Central Cities 50,000+	30.11	2.61	30.70	1.98		

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Item Number	Situations / Bipolar Adjective Dimension	Control - Form A L.S. Mean	Control - Form A S.E.	Treatment - Form B L.S. Mean	Treatment - Form B S.E.	F
VIII.	YOUNGSTER STEALS					
	Farm	23.85	1.13	21.79	1.08	
	Town Under 10,000	24.34	1.19	22.31	1.07	.11
	Towns and Cities 10,000+	24.69	1.15	21.64	1.12	
	Suburbs of Cities 50,000+	23.66	1.40	21.65	1.25	
	Central City 50,000+	25.06	1.03	22.90	1.54	
IX.	CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION					
	Farm	17.31	1.56	16.09	1.48	
	Town Under 10,000	17.65	1.63	15.60	1.47	
	Towns and Cities 10,000+	18.62	1.58	16.38	1.54	.14
	Suburbs of Cities 50,000+	17.52	1.92	16.75	1.72	
	Central City 50,000+	22.25	2.79	19.65	2.12	
X.	ONLY PERSON STANDING					
	Farm	25.23	1.63	22.19	1.55	
	Towns Under 10,000	26.30	1.71	23.32	1.54	
	Towns and Cities 10,000+	25.54	1.66	22.56	1.62	.22
	Suburbs of Cities 50,000+	29.05	2.02	24.18	1.80	
	Central City 50,000+	26.73	2.93	25.50	2.22	

10,000 and open country held more negative attitudes toward blacks than did subjects from suburbs of cities 50,000 and subjects living in central cities of 50,000 and up in eight situations (I, II, III, IV, V, VII, IX, X). There was a significant difference at .05 or above in attitudes based on place of residence in two situations, II Man Rapes Woman and V Friend Becomes Engaged. In Situation II, subjects from farms and subjects from towns under 10,000 and open country held more negative attitudes than did subjects from towns and cities 10,000 to 50,000.

In situation V, farm people held more negative attitudes if a friend became engaged to a black than did people from towns and cities 10,000 to 50,000 or people from central cities of 50,000 and larger. People from towns under 10,000 and open country held more negative attitudes than did people from central cities 50,000 and up.

Of the adults completing the SAS, nearly half were volunteer 4-H leaders. The other half of the population included State 4-H Leaders, other Extension professionals and staff personnel at the National 4-H Center. An analysis of this data as related to the position in which the subjects were serving revealed that there was no significant difference in any of the ten situations.

An additional factor which was considered in this research was that of age. An analysis of this data revealed that there was no significant difference in the attitudes of the subjects based on age.

XI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study reveals that in some situations as identified in the SAS there is a significant difference in the attitudes of the white adults

involved in this research. These attitudes are generally more negative toward blacks than they are toward whites. Significant factors related to these attitudes include the region of the country in which the subjects reside and the population density of the area of residence. Sex also may be a factor (significant in one situation). Factors which were analyzed and were not significant in any of the situations tested include age and the position in the organization held by the subject.

Based on these findings and the findings of a related study,[39] the following recommendations are offered. (1) Additional situational attitude research be conducted with Extension personnel to include supervision and administration and teen leadership. (2) More extensive attitudinal research be conducted based on region of the country and other non-tested factors such as degree of integration of the area and the degree of integration of the program. (3) Test attitudes toward different situations such as integrated 4-H clubs, integrated social events and integrated Extension staffs. (4) Research Extension attitudes toward other minorities to include Spanish-American and Indians. (5) Research the attitudes of minorities toward whites. (6) Develop programs that will enable Extension personnel to determine their racial attitudes both individually and collectively. Create an environment in which individuals can realistically come to grips with their racial attitudes so that they can make necessary changes in their attitudes or modification in their behavior to insure that their attitudes and behavior are not limiting the involvement of minorities in existing Extension programs. (7) Provide training so that Extension personnel can become as effective change agents for social attitudes and behavior as they have become change

agents of technology. Through this approach Extension can work toward and help to insure equal opportunity for all Americans.

LITERATURE CITED

[1]John C. Brigham, and Theodore A. Weissbach (eds.), Racial Attitudes in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), p. 1.

[2]Angus Campbell, White Attitudes Toward Black People (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1971), p. 155.

[3]Michael Harrington, The Other America (New York: MacMillan, 1966).

[4]Alice Miel, The Shortchanged Children of Suburbia (New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1967).

[5]U. S. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Report (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), p. 116.

[6]Harrington, op. cit., p. 72.

[7]William J. Brink, and Louis Harris, Black and White: A Study of U. S. Racial Attitudes Today (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967), p. 129.

[8]Helen Ball, "Racial Attitudes of White Educators in a Situational Context" (Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Maryland, 1971), p. 102.

[9]U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racism in America and How to Combat It (Washington: U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1970).

[10]M. Schwebel, Who Can Be Educated? (New York: Grove Press, 1968), p. 154.

[11]United States Department of Agriculture, Supplemental Instructions for Administration of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Washington: Federal Extension Service, July 2, 1965) p. 2.

[12]"Affirmative Action Plan for Meeting Nondiscriminatory Legal Standards in Employment and the Conduct of All Programs by State Cooperative Extension Services" (Washington: U.S.D.S. Mimeo, February, 1972).

[13]Federal Register, Part II (Washington: December 4, 1964), p. 16275.

[14]United States Department of Agriculture, Amendment to Section B, II, B, 2 of Supplemental Instructions for Administration of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Dated July 2, 1965 (Washington: U.S.D.A., Federal Extension Service, October 6, 1965), pp. 1-2.

[15]ECOP Subcommittee on Staff Training and Development, National Policy Statement on Staff Training and Development (Madison: University Extension, The University of Wisconsin, 1968), p. 3.

[16]A People and A Spirit (A condensation of the report of the Joint Federal Extension Service, USDA-NASULGC Study Committee on Cooperative Extension. (Fort Collins: Printing and Publication Service, Colorado State University, November, 1968), p. 8.

[17]Ibid., p. 16.

[18]Marvin E. Shaw, and Jack M. Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), p. 358.

[19]Ernest R. Hilgard, and Gordon H. Bower, Theories of Learning (New York: Merideth Publishing Company, 1966), p. 21.

[20]Charles A. Kiesler, Barry E. Collins, and Norman Miller, Attitude Change A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Approaches (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1969), p. 4.

[21]Howard Kingsley, and Ralph Garry, The Nature and Condition of Learning (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 471.

[22]Roy D. Cassell, Taped interview with Director Civil Rights Compliance, Extension Service, U.S.D.A., November 30, 1973.

[23]William E. Sedlacek, and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr., The Development of a Measure of Racial Attitudes (College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland, Counseling Center Research Report #10-69, 1969).

[24]Shaw and Wright, op. cit., p. 3.

[25]Federal Extension Service, op. cit., p. 1.

[26]Abraham N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement (New York: Basic Books, 1966), p. 121.

[27]Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957), p. 198.

[28]Charles E. Osgood, "Nature and Measurement of Meaning," Psychological Bulletin, 44:222. 1952.

[29]William E. Sedlacek and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr., loc. cit.

[30]Charles G. Eberly, An Alternative Analysis for the Situational Attitude Scale (East Lansing: Office of Evaluation Services, Michigan State University, Research Report #5, 1972).

[31]Ball, op. cit., pp. 33-40.

[32]William E. Sedlacek, Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr., and Lester A. Mindus, Racial Attitudes of White University Students and Their Parents, (College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland Cultural Study Center Research Report #2-73, 1973.)

[33]Gene C. Whaples, "The Situational Attitude Scale As An Attitude Measurement Tool For Adults Involved In Extension 4-H and Youth Programs" (Washington: United States Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service, 1974).

[34]Gene C. Whaples, "Attitudes of White 4-H Professionals Toward Blacks" (PhD. Dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, 1974).

[35]National 4-H Foundation, Impact, Annual Review National 4-H Foundation (Washington: National 4-H Foundation, 1971), p. 1.

[36]Ibid., p. 13.

[37]Walter R. Harvey, Instructions For Use Of LSMLGP (Least Squares And Maximum Likelihood General Purpose Program), (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1968).

[38]Roger E. Kirk, Experimental Design Procedure For The Behavioral Sciences, (Belmont, California: Books/Cole Publishing Company, 1968), pp. 91-93.

[39]Whaples, "Attitudes of White 4-H Professionals Toward Blacks."